

Appl. No.: 10/804,346  
Docket No.: DB001095-000  
Amdt. Dated: 3 August 2005  
Reply to Office action of 13 June 2005

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

In response to the Office action, Applicants have amended the abstract and replaced the title with the title suggested by the Examiner. The specification has also been amended to correct a typographical error.

In the Office action, claims 1 – 14 were indicated as being allowable. However, claims 15 and 16 were not mentioned in the Office action. Claim 15 depends from allowable claim 14 and therefore is also believed to be in condition for allowance. Claim 16 is believed to contain subject matter similar to the allowed claims such that claim 16 should also be in condition for allowance.

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the instant application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance for claims 1 – 16 is respectfully requested. If the Examiner is of the opinion that the instant application is in condition for disposition other than through allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Applicants' attorney so that additional changes may be discussed.

Respectfully submitted,



Edward L. Pencoske  
Reg. No. 29,688  
Thorp Reed & Armstrong LLP  
One Oxford Centre  
301 Grant Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Pittsburgh, PA 15219-1425  
(412) 394-7789

Attorneys for Applicant